

Attorney Docket: 00216
09/749,825 Art Unit 2623 Examiner Saltarelli
Resubmission of Amendment in Response to May 9, 2008 Final Office Action

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated May 9, 2008, and in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed November 19, 2008, the Assignee respectfully submits the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 5-14, 36, and 39-46 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2-4, 15-35, 37-38, and 47-51 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejections under § 112

The Office rejected claims 1 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. These claims, however, have been amended and no longer resemble their examiner form. The Office is respectfully requested to re-examiner claims 1 and 30 in their current presentation.

Rejection of Claims under § 103 (a)

The Office rejects claims 1, 5-6, 15-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36-38, 40-41, and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,005,861 to Humpleman in view of U.S. Patent 6,493,875 to Eames, *et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,732,366 to Russo.

First, claims 15-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-34, and 37-38 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, so the rejection of these claims is moot.

Attorney Docket: 00216
09/749,825 Art Unit 2623 Examiner Saltarelli
Resubmission of Amendment in Response to May 9, 2008 Final Office Action

Second, claims 1, 5-6, 36, and 44-46 are not obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by the combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “*storing a browser-based graphical user interface in memory, the residential gateway receiving an instruction from a client device to retrieve the graphical user interface from the memory and to send the graphical user interface to the client device.*” Support for such features may found at least at page 7, line 22 through page 8, line 10 and at page 9, lines 1-5. Independent claim 36 recites similar features.

The combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo* does not obviate these features. *Humpleman* and *Russo* have been previously discussed in great detail in the official record, so no further explanation is needed. *Eames* teaches a gateway having “a set of buses” to route information. See U.S. Patent 6,493,875 to Eames, et al. at column 5, lines 25-35 and at FIG. 3. Even so, the combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo* fails to teach or suggest all the features recited by independent claims 1 and 36. *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*, for example, fails to teach or suggest “*receiving an instruction from a client device to retrieve the graphical user interface from the memory and to send the graphical user interface to the client device.*” One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that independent claims 1 and 36 are obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*.

Claims 1, 5-6, 36, and 44-46, then, are not obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*. Independent claims 1 and 36 recite many features that are not taught or suggested by the proposed combination of *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*, and their respective dependent claims incorporate these features and recite additional features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that these claims are obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo*, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claims 4 & 39 under § 103 (a)

Attorney Docket: 00216
09/749,825 Art Unit 2623 Examiner Saltarelli
Resubmission of Amendment in Response to May 9, 2008 Final Office Action

Claims 4 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,809,069 to Meyer.

Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, so the rejection of claim 4 is moot.

Claim 39, however, is not obvious over the combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Meyer*. Claim 39 depends from independent claim 36 and, thus, incorporates the same distinguishing features. As the above paragraphs already explained, *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo* are silent to all the features of independent claim 36, and *Meyer* does not cure these deficiencies. While *Meyer* discloses a “picture in a picture” processor, the combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Meyer* still fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 36, from which claim 39 depends. The Office is thus respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of this claim.

Rejection of Claims 7 & 42 under § 103 (a)

The Office also rejects claims 7 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,768,527 to Zhu, et al. Claims 7 and 42, however, are not obvious over the combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Zhu*. Claim 7 and 42 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1 and 36 and, thus, incorporate the same distinguishing features. As the above paragraphs already explained, *Humpleman, Eames, and Russo* are silent to all the features of independent claims 1 and 36, and *Zhu* does not cure these deficiencies. *Zhu* discloses a “rate scaler” that reduces bitrates of multimedia streams. Still, though, the combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Zhu* still fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 36. The combined teaching of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Zhu*, then, cannot obviate claims 7 and 42, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claims 8-14, 21 & 43 under § 103 (a)

Attorney Docket: 00216
09/749,825 Art Unit 2623 Examiner Saltarelli
Resubmission of Amendment in Response to May 9, 2008 Final Office Action

Claims 8-14, 21, and 43 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Humpleman*, *Eames*, and *Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,104,861 to Tsukagoshi and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,473,772 to Halliwell, *et al.*

First, claim 21 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, so the rejection of claim 4 is moot.

Claims 8-14 and 43, though, are not obvious over the combined teaching of *Humpleman*, *Eames*, *Russo*, *Tsukagoshi*, and *Halliwell*. These claims depend from either independent claim 1 or 36 and, thus, incorporate the same distinguishing features. As the above paragraphs already explained, *Humpleman*, *Eames*, and *Russo* are silent to all the features of independent claims 1 and 36, and the added teachings of *Tsukagoshi* and *Halliwell* do not cure these deficiencies. Even if *Tsukagoshi* discloses a “content item storage position identifier,” and even if *Halliwell* allegedly discloses “*a new content item storage position identifier*,” the combined teaching of *Humpleman*, *Eames*, *Russo*, *Tsukagoshi*, and *Halliwell* still fails to teach or suggest all the features independent claims 1 and 36. Claims 8-14 and 43, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claims 26, 35 & 47 under § 103 (a)

The Office also rejects claims 26, 35, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Humpleman*, *Eames*, and *Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,483,902 to Stewart, *et al.* These claims been canceled, so the rejection is moot.

Rejection of Claim 31 under § 103 (a)

Claim 31 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Humpleman*, *Eames*, and *Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,154,206 to Ludtke. Claim 31, however, has been canceled, so the rejection of this claim is moot.

Attorney Docket: 00216
09/749,825 Art Unit 2623 Examiner Saltarelli
Resubmission of Amendment in Response to May 9, 2008 Final Office Action

If any questions arise, the Examiner is invited contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629
or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390